

Message

---

**From:** Yogi, David [Yogi.David@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 2/12/2019 5:06:21 PM  
**To:** Sanchez, Yolanda [Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov]; Herrera, Angeles [Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov]; LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]  
**CC:** Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** RE: Draft to Dan for your review - FW: Hunters Pt

Thanks, Yolanda. I think this carries the right sentiment. It's direct and clear, and communicates our wanting to listen to understand and learn.

- David

David Yogi  
Section Chief  
Superfund Community Involvement  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Ph: 415-972-3350  
Mobile: 415-760-5419  
Email: [yogi.david@epa.gov](mailto:yogi.david@epa.gov)

---

**From:** Sanchez, Yolanda  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 12, 2019 8:55 AM  
**To:** Herrera, Angeles <Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov>; LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>  
**Cc:** Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; Yogi, David <Yogi.David@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Draft to Dan for your review - FW: Hunters Pt

My recommendation is to allude to what Dan has said in the past without quoting him (similar to Angeles' addition). Of course, I don't have the experience of the relationship as you all do. Happy to discuss! I'm including David, in case he has other thoughts...

Hi Dan,

Thank you for telling us more about your thoughts ~~plans~~ for the meeting.

Based on these previous emails and our discussion at the last CAC meeting on January 28, we assumed you want on Friday understood you wanted an opportunity to present information critical to the site work at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. So, we planned a meeting to listen and learn. ~~and that you want us to listen and ask questions. That is what we planned for.~~ If you want more from us than that, we ~~may~~ will need to reschedule for a later time. We prefer to hear the your information soon, so that we have more time to digest it and consider it carefully as we move forward. We hope that you will still want go ahead with meeting this Friday, with the ~~above~~ expectation for EPA's role to listen.

Yolanda

---

**From:** Herrera, Angeles  
**Sent:** Monday, February 11, 2019 8:44 PM  
**To:** LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>  
**Cc:** Sanchez, Yolanda <Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Draft to Dan for your review - FW: Hunters Pt

Thxs Lily! Minor addition underlined.  
Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 11, 2019, at 6:27 PM, LEE, LILY <[LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV](mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV)> wrote:

Dear Angeles, John, and Yolanda,

Here is a draft for your review. Please change the subject line before sending.

Hi Dan,

Thank you for telling us more about your plans for the meeting. In the email chain below:

On January 30, you wrote, "It would be useful to set up a meeting between our team and the EPA team, as soon as possible, to pass on to you information that contradicts what we currently know the Navy appears to have claimed for its PRG changes, and a number of other critical issues related to the Parcel G retesting plan, Five Year Review etc."

On February 6, you wrote, "we would like to provide EPA with information critical to its HPS CERCLA oversight role; and it will be hard to present our information and EPA to have a chance to discuss it and ask questions if limited to one hour. "

Based on these previous emails and our discussion at the last CAC meeting on January 28, we assumed you want on Friday to present information and that you want us to listen and ask questions. That is what we planned for. If you want more from us than that, we may need to reschedule for a later time. We would prefer, however, to hear the information you are offering earlier rather than later so that we have more time to digest it and consider it carefully as we move forward. We hope that you will still want go ahead with meeting this Friday, with the above expectation for EPA's role.

Regards,  
Angeles

---

**From:** DanielHirsch <[dhirsch1@cruzio.com](mailto:dhirsch1@cruzio.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 11, 2019 3:07 PM  
**To:** Herrera, Angeles <[Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov](mailto:Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** LEE, LILY <[LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV](mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV)>; Yogi, David <[Yogi.David@epa.gov](mailto:Yogi.David@epa.gov)>; Chesnutt, John <[Chesnutt.John@epa.gov](mailto:Chesnutt.John@epa.gov)>; Walker, Stuart <[Walker.Stuart@epa.gov](mailto:Walker.Stuart@epa.gov)>; Manzanilla, Enrique <[Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov](mailto:Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov)>; Sanchez, Yolanda <[Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov](mailto:Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov)>; Benson, Michele <[Benson.Michele@epa.gov](mailto:Benson.Michele@epa.gov)>; Kwok, Frances <[Kwok.Frances@epa.gov](mailto:Kwok.Frances@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Hunters Pt

Hi Angeles,

I will be accompanied by three of my assistants — Taylor Altenbern, Maria Caine, and Haakon Willams — and Dr. Robert Gould, a physician with Physicians or Social Responsibility who has been assisting with some of the human health issues.

Could you let us know who will be attending for EPA and their roles? And could you provide email addresses for those who will be not physically present but will be on by phone, so I can send a copy of our Powerpoint presentation so they can follow along?

We will need a Powerpoint projector and screen.

You indicated that the role of the EPA participants "will be predominantly to listen, rather than engage in responding." While we understand that EPA will not want to make commitments at the meeting, we

think that for the meeting to be productive, given the complex and important technical issues to be addressed, the meeting would benefit from a real discussion of those matters, with questions and give-and-take delving into the fundamentals.

We look forward to talking with you and your team on Friday.

Best wishes,

Dan

On Feb 7, 2019, at 12:12 PM, Herrera, Angeles <[Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov](mailto:Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov)> wrote:

Thanks Dan!

Let's meet next Friday, February 15 from 1:30-3pm in our offices. Please provide a list of the attendees so that we can make the necessary arrangements with our building security.

Thanks,  
Angeles

---

**From:** DanielHirsch <[dhirsch1@cruzio.com](mailto:dhirsch1@cruzio.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 06, 2019 5:05 PM  
**To:** Herrera, Angeles <[Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov](mailto:Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** LEE, LILY <[LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV](mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV)>; Yogi, David <[Yogi.David@epa.gov](mailto:Yogi.David@epa.gov)>; Chesnutt, John <[Chesnutt.John@epa.gov](mailto:Chesnutt.John@epa.gov)>; Walker, Stuart <[Walker.Stuart@epa.gov](mailto:Walker.Stuart@epa.gov)>; Manzanilla, Enrique <[Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov](mailto:Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov)>; Sanchez, Yolanda <[Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov](mailto:Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov)>; Benson, Michele <[Benson.Michele@epa.gov](mailto:Benson.Michele@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Hunters Pt

Hi Angeles,

Thanks for the suggested meeting times.

Friday at 1:30 works best for us. We would come to your offices in San Francisco. We would hope you could have your headquarters PRG expert, Stuart Walker, on by phone, and if possible, any other key technical people working on the PRG calculation issues who might be based other than in SF (e.g. Las Vegas).

We do not think a joint meeting with Mr. Castleman and his client would be appropriate. He doesn't represent us, and the matters he and his client presumably want to discuss are not the technical details of the PRG calculations, retesting plans, and other issues we wish to inform EPA about. A joint meeting would leave us—your team and ours—with very little time to delve into those details. For those reasons, we believe there should be separate meetings.

Additionally, if at all possible, at least an hour and a half would be useful for our meeting. There is a lot of technical material to go over; the EPA has had extensive conversations with the Navy; we believe the Navy has not been entirely candid with EPA and we would like to provide EPA with information critical to its HPS CERCLA oversight role; and it will be hard to present our information and EPA to have a chance to discuss it and ask questions if limited to one hour. A great deal hangs in the balance for public

health and the environment; EPA doesn't want to have to approve or disapprove Navy plans and claims on the basis of incomplete information from the Navy.

Lastly, we must reiterate that we have not seen the Navy PRG calculations and are basing our present concerns on what the Navy has said publicly it is doing to change the EPA defaults, Navy assumptions we will show are questionable. We repeat that we believe EPA should make clear to the Navy that there needs to be a formal public comment period on the revised draft Five Year Review and associated PRG claims, and that EPA should not decide whether to approve them until it has been able to review those comments.

Thanks,

Dan